

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-25 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 16, and 22 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 1-25 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 16-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0149571 (hereafter Roberts), in view of Takahata et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,556,189 (hereafter Takahata). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A display assembly for a handheld electronic device comprising:
a display mechanism;
a plurality of pressure activated sensors; and
a housing for enclosing said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors, said housing comprising:
an external surface that defines body of said handheld electronic device,
a single-piece bezel-less top cover that allows mechanical transfer between said top cover and said plurality of pressure activated sensors, wherein said pressure activated sensors can be activated by mechanical pressure applied to said single-piece bezel-less top cover, and
a back cover **connected** to said single-piece bezel-less top cover such that an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said single-piece bezel-less top cover, of said external surface is flush. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Roberts and Takahata does not teach, motivate, or suggest the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, **"a housing for enclosing said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors,"** (emphasis added), and, "said housing comprising: **an external surface that defines body of said handheld electronic device...**a back cover **connected** to said single-piece bezel-less top cover **such that an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said single-piece bezel-less top cover, of said external surface is flush,**" (emphasis added). At page 3 of the Final Office Action, it is admitted that Roberts does not teach the top cover is a single-piece bezel-less, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1, and a back cover...external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Further, element 102 of Figure 2 of Roberts is cited as corresponding to the external surface recited in Independent Claim 1. However, element is described (in paragraphs 0084, 0101, and 0102) as being a transparent panel instead of being an external surface (of the housing) that defines body of the device, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Moreover, Takahata is cited to support the rejection.

However, Takahata shows a housing for a device formed by the upper film (6) and the back cover (7), where the housing does not enclose, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. That is, a sealing material (8) fills the gap between the upper film (6) and the back cover (7) because the upper film (6) is not connected to the back cover (7), as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Further, since the housing does not enclose, the housing does not include an external surface that defines the body of the device as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Since the upper film (6) is not connected to the back

cover (7), there is no area (of the external surface of the housing) that represents transition between the back cover (7) and the upper film (6), as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. As a result, the combination of Roberts and Takahata fails to teach, motivate, or suggest a housing that encloses the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors and that comprises an external surface that defines body of the device, a single-piece bezel-less top cover, and a back cover connected to the single-piece bezel-less top cover such that an area, which represents transition between the back cover and the single-piece bezel-less top cover, of the external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Roberts and Takahata does not teach, motivate, or suggest all the limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-14 are patentable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 16 and 22, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 16 and 22 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 16 recites the limitations, "**a *housing for enclosing said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors***," (emphasis added), and, the housing comprising "***an external***

surface... a back cover **connected** to said transparent single-piece cover such that **an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said transparent single-piece cover, of said external surface is flush,**" (emphasis added). Independent Claim 22 recites the limitations, "said **housing encloses said display mechanism and said pressure activated sensors,**" (emphasis added), and, the housing comprising "**an external surface...**said back cover is **connected** to said transparent single-piece cover such that **an area, which represents transition between said back cover and said transparent single-piece cover, of said external surface is flush,**" (emphasis added). As discussed above, the combination of Roberts and Takahata fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the cited limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 16 and 22 are patentable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata and allowable for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 17-21 and Dependent Claims 23-25 dependent on allowable Independent Claims 16 and 22, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 17-21 and Dependent Claims 23-25 are patentable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0149571 (hereafter Roberts), in view of Takahata et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,556,189 (hereafter Takahata), in view of Donohue et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,262,717 (hereafter Donohue), and in view of Singh et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,400,376 (hereafter Singh). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claim 15 is dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, which is allowable over the combination of Roberts and Takahata. Moreover, Donahue and Singh do not teach, suggest, or motivate a housing that encloses the display mechanism and the pressure activated sensors and that comprises an external surface that defines body of the device, a single-piece bezel-less top cover, and a back cover connected to the single-piece bezel-less top cover such that an area, which represents transition between the back cover and the single-piece bezel-less top cover, of the external surface is flush, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Roberts, Takahata, Donahue, and Singh for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claim 15 depends from Independent Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Roberts, Takahata, Donahue, and Singh for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, remarks, and arguments overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-25) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-25) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: _____

8/17/2006

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060